Brief Examination

OF SOME

PASSAGES

IN THE

Chronological Part of a Letter,

WRITTEN TO

Dr. SHERLOCK

IN HIS

VINDICATION.

In a Letter to a Friend.

[S. Grascome?]

12° *London*, Printed and Sold by *Randal Taylor* near *Stationers-Hall*.

[1700?]

UMI

A

Brief Examination, &c:

SIR,

AS to the Letter which I mention'd in my laſt, I ſhall only reflect upon ſome Paſſages in the Chronological part of it; the Examination of the whole I leave to the Ingenious perſon, that is more eſpecially concern'd.

The Gentleman, that writ the Letter, manifeſts in one paſſage of it, that his Chronology doth according to his own Judgment depend much upon this, that the *Sanballat* in *Joſephus* is not the ſame with the *Sanballat* in *Nehemiah*. For *pag.* 19 ſpeaking of the Convocation, (he ſays,) that *by making his* Sanballat (i.e. *Joſephus*'s) *the ſame with Nehemiah's, it appears, that they follow* Scaliger *and* Calviſius *in their Chronology:* So that whoſoever makes him to be the ſame *Sanballat* that is mention'd in both, he, in this Gentleman's judgment, follows *Scaliger* and *Calviſius* in their Chronology. Of which he gives this account, *pag.* 18. They begin *Daniel's* 70 weeks in *Darius Nothus* his time, and make *Nehemiah's Artaxerxes* to be *Mnemon*, inſtead of *Longimanus*, as the *Darius* mention'd by him, they make not to be *Nothus*, but *Codomannus*, and the Prieſt, that *Nehemiah* depriv'd, to be *Manaſſes*, the ſame that we read of in *Joſephus*. All this (ſays he) *Scaliger* and *Calviſius* are for, and he would perſuade us, that the *Convocation* are alſo for it, but he himſelf is againſt it.

As to the *Convocation*, I believe they do not ſay that *Joſephus's Sanballat* is the ſame with *Nehemiah's*; but telling us out of *Joſephus*, that *Jaddus* and *Manaſſes* fell at variance, that *Manaſſes* married *Sanballat's* Daughter, and was remov'd from the Prieſthood, they ſet in the Margin, *Neh.* 13. 28. from whence this Gentleman concludes, that they make his *Sanballat* the ſame with *Nehe-*

miah's; and *by their so doing* (says he) *it appears that they follow* Scaliger *and* Calvisius *in their Chronology*. But against the necessity of this consequence, I argue thus; If every one that makes *Josephus's Sanballat* the same with *Nehemiah's*, must follow *Scaliger* and *Calvisius in their Chronology*, and so make *Nehemiah's Artaxerxes* to be *Mnemon*, not *Longimanus*; how comes it, that so many excellently Learned Men, Bishop *Montague*, *Functius*, *&c.* do make the same *Sanballat* to be spoken of in both, and yet hold, that *Nehemiah's Artaxerxes* was *Longimanus*? If they did not follow *Scaliger* and *Calvisius* (notwithstanding that they held the aforesaid opinion, touching *Sanballat*) then this Gentleman concluded too hastily, that the *Convocation* did follow them. Besides, the only reason which this Gentleman gives, *pag.* 11. why, if we hold *Nehemiah* and *Josephus* to speak of the same *Sanballat*, it is necessary to make *Nehemiah's Artaxerxes* to be *Mnemon*, not *Longimanus*, is because the *Sanballat*, that was the Adversary of the *Jews* in the 20th year of *Longimanus*, must have been much above 120 years old in *Alexander's* time. But Bishop *Montague* answers readily to this, by giving instances of several persons, that have liv'd to much above 120 years.

Further, why should not this Gentleman have thought that the *Convocation* follow'd *Sulpitius Severus*, rather than *Scaliger* and *Calvisius*? For it is known, that *Sulpitius*, *&c.* begun *Daniel's* weeks in *Darius Nothus* his time, (long before *Scaliger* did;) as also he referr'd *Nehemiah's* building the Walls and Gates of the City, to the Reign of *Artaxerxes Mnemon*; and I believe that the Reverend Clergy of the *Convocation*, studied such ancient Writers as *Sulpitius*, more than they did *Scaliger*, or other Neotericks As to *Calvisius*, they might not have seen his Chronology, yea, I question, whether it was extant, when the *Convocation*-Book was finish'd, and then there is no reason why they should be said to follow *Calvisius*. I have inlarg'd on this the more, because I conceive that this Gentleman hath made too bold with the *Convocation* in this passage, (as both he and others have done in other things;) for by making *Josephus's Sanballat* the same with *Nehemiah's*, it doth not appear, that they follow'd either *Scaliger* or *Calvisius*.

To

To return to that which we were saying at first, since this Gentleman's Chronology in his judgment depends much upon this, that *Josephus's Sanballat* is not the same with *Nehemiah's*, it will not be amiss to examine what this Gentleman hath to say, *pag.* 11. against his being the same. *Josephus* (says he) *describes him by those Characters, by which we may be sure that he was not the same* Sanballat. If you ask what Characters they are, (he says) *First, That this was a* Chuthæan, *of that race from which the* Samaritans *came; and farther, that he was sent to be Governour of* Samaria *by the last* Darius; whereas this Gentleman tells us of this other *Sanballat*, that he was a *Moabite of* Horonaim, *whom* Nehemiah *found in* Palestine 100 *years before in* Artaxerxes *his time*. But first, The Scripture doth not plainly say of *Nehemiah's Sanballat*, either that he was a *Moabite*, or of *Horonaim*; it only calls him the *Horonite*, whether from *Horonaim*, or from some other place, is uncertain. But to pass this, secondly, He might be a *Chuthæan* originally, and yet his Habitation might have been for the most part at *Horonaim*, and he thereupon call'd the *Horonite*. Thirdly, Arch-bishop *Usher*, *Grotius*, and others think that he was Toparch, or Deputy-Governour of the *Moabites*; and it is in no wise improbable, that the same person, who was constituted Governour of the *Moabites* by *Artaxerxes*, should afterwards be advanc'd to be Governour of *Samaria* by *Darius*. Fourthly, As to that of 100 years, they who hold *Nehemiah's Artaxerxes* to be *Longimanus*, must grant that *Nehemiah* found *Sanballat* in *Palestine* 100 years before the time of the last *Darius*, (and they say that he liv'd to so great an age that that might be,) but *Sulpitius Severus*, and those that follow him, must and do deny it. Thus it appears, that we cannot be sure that he was not the same *Sanballat*, either by the Characters by which *Josephus* describes him, or by any thing which this Gentleman saith.

As this Gentleman made bold with the Convocation, so he also makes bold with the *Jewish Chronologers*, though I willingly grant that they deserve not that regard which the *Convocation* doth. He tells us, *pag.* 14. that *they make the whole time of the second Temple, till the sixth year of* Alexander *the Great* (*in which sixth year they say he came up against* Jerusalem) *to be but* 34 *years*, and

for this he cites *Ganz*, *pag.* 57, and 64. But indeed the *Jewish* Writers differ among themselves about the time of the continuance of the *Persian* Empire, after the finishing of the *second Temple*, yet *Ganz* expresses his Opinion very plainly, *viz.* that the time of the *second Temple*, to the first year of *Alexander*, was 34 years, but till the sixth year of *Alexander* it was forty years, and so we read in *Juchasin* fol. 13. 2. that *Alexander* came to *Jerusalem* forty years after the building of the *Temple*.

But this Gentleman makes more bold with the *Jewish* Writers, when he makes them to say of *Jaddus* the High Priest, and all the Elders of *Israel*, that *they made a Covenant with* Alexander, *(though* Darius *was then living,)* for which he cites *Ganz*, *p.* 59. But these are not *Ganz* his words; he only says that *Alexander made a Covenant with* Jaddus, whom he calls *Simeon the just*: And I believe you will be strangely surpriz'd when I tell you from R. *Abraham F. David* his *Cabala*, what that Covenant was: He covenanted (says he) with the High Priest, that every Child that was born to any of the Priests that year, should be call'd *Alexander*, after his name, and that they should begin their *Æra contractuum* from him.

Josephus, *l.* 11. *c.* 5, and 8. acquaints us, that both *Nehemiah* and *Sanballat* liv'd to old age: and of *Nehemiah*, this Gentleman saith, *pag.* 8. *No doubt he lived to a very great age, for he was Cupbearer to King* Artaxerxes *in the 20th year of his Reign. We may suppose him to have been then about 25 years of age; after that he liv'd to see the High Priesthood pass from Father to Son for four Generations: And he saw a fifth coming in view, namely,* Jaddua, *whom we suppose to have been then about 30 years old. All this might very well be, if* Nehemiah *were born 470 years before Christ, and writ in the year 347 before Christ, then he was about 104 years old.* These are this Gentleman's own words out of which we must pick his sense as well as we can; and when we have done our best, I doubt we shall scarce understand, either how the things cohere, or how they prove, that *Nehemiah* liv'd to a very great age.

1. I cannot see the coherence, particularly of that last passage, *if Nehemiah were born 470 years before Christ, and writ in the 347th year before Christ, then he was about 104 years old*; for from the year 470 before

before Christ, to the year 347 before him are 123 years; so that this Gentleman had expressed himself more coherently, if he had said, *Then he was about* 124 *years old.* Some perhaps will say, that 347 is the Printer's mistake for 374; for this Gentleman says, *pag.* 1. that *Nehemiah writ his Book Anno* 374, *before Christ.* Well, we now then suppose *Nehemiah* to have lived from the year 470 before Christ to the year 374; but then he would not have been about 104 years old, but about 96; so that I despair still of making things cohere. But then:

2. I cannot see how all together proves that *Nehemiah* lived to a very great age; for 1. They are only Suppositions, which make up a great part of what is said, and those can prove nothing. 2. There is nothing certain, but that after *Nehemiah* came from *Susa* to *Jerusalem*, he liv'd to see the High Priesthood pass from Father to Son for some Generations; but unless we were certain for how many Generations, whether four or three, or only two; as also how many years every Person enjoy'd the High-Priest's Function, we cannot prove from thence, to what age *Nehemiah* liv'd. 3. When this Gentleman says, that *Nehemiah* saw the Priesthood pass from Father to Son for four Generations; his meaning is, that it pass'd from *Joiakim* to *Eliashib*, from *Eliashib* to *Joiada*, from *Joiada* to *Johanan*; and withal he begins his computation in the last year of *Joiakim*, and ends it in the first of *Johanan*; so that the time of *Eliashib*'s and *Joiada*'s enjoying the Priesthood, being added to the 25 years, which he is suppos'd to have liv'd when he came from *Susa* to *Jerusalem*, is in effect all the time we have to make up *Nehemiah*'s age, according to this Gentleman.

He troubles himself much about the time of *Nehemiah*'s writing his Book: 1. He affirms, *p.* 6. that it was writ after the Death of *Longimanus*, and in or after the time of his Successor *Darius*. *This* (says he) *is certain, for in his Book he mentions the Reign of* Darius *the Persian*: But why may we not think, notwithstanding this, that the rest of the Book was writ before the Death of *Longimanus*, and that this touching the Reign of *Darius*, and a few other passages, might be inserted by *Nehemiah*, or some other afterwards. 2. He insists upon it, *pag.* 7. that *Nehemiah* writ, when

the

the Reign of *Darius* was expired: *The Hebrew words* (says he) *shew it, for there* (i. e. Neh. 12. 22.) *it is said, that the heads of the Levites, and also the Priests were recorded* על מלכות דריוש *over or throughout the Reign of* Darius; Our Translation hath, *to the Reign of Darius*; other Translations, *in the Reign*, &c. but these not favouring, he must, without Example or Warrant, to serve his *Hypothesis*, translate *Over or throughout the Reign of* Darius. There is no question, but that על sometimes signifies *Over*, as that is the same with *Above*; but he should have alledg'd some other Text or Texts of Scripture, in which it signifies *Over*, in the sense of his *Throughout*, or some Authority for it; and when he doth this, he doth something. But let the words signifie what they will, they must be understood as he would have them, *which appears* (says he) *by what followeth in the next verse, where it is said, that the Heads of the Levites were recorded in the Book of the Chronicles, till the days of* Johanan, i. e. *till he came to be High-Priest*. Yea, rather the contrary appears from thence, if we will acquiesce in Archbishop *Usher*'s judgment, for he (in his Annals *A. M.* 3589.) makes *Johanan* to have been High Priest in the Reign of *Darius*, i. e. *Nothus*; and if he was so, then these words, till the days of *Johanan*, *Neh.* 12. 23. cannot prove that the meaning must be *Throughout the Reign of Darius*, *v.* 22. but (if any thing) the contrary.

Here and elsewhere I press this Gentleman with Archbishop *Usher*'s Authority, because he alledges him so oft in his Letters and declares his great esteem of his judgment, *The most Learned Primate was as well a great Chronologer as a good Textuary*, so *pag.* 7. and *pag.* 9. when he had told how he supposed *Jaddus* born at such a time in compliance with the most Learned Primate, he adds these words, *I attribute very much to his judgment in these matters*. 3. This Gentleman makes *Nehemiah* to have writ his Book when *Johanan* came to be High-Priest, (see *pag.* 7. also 9. and 10.) but if you demand his proof of this, he only saith, *pag.* 9. that he hath *very good ground* for it; but he is not so kind as to tell what it is. So that by all that he hath said concerning *Nehemiah*'s age, and writing his Book, he hath only demonstrated, that it cannot be determin'd particularly to what age he lived, or at what time he writ.

This

This Gentleman alſo in *pag.* 7. troubles himſelf about *Neh.* 12. 22, 23. He ſays, that *Nehemiah in them tells us, that as for the* Levites, *that were in the days of* Eliaſhib, Joiada, Johanan *and* Jaddua, *the heads of thoſe* Levites; *and alſo the Prieſts, all that were in the Reign of* Darius Nothus, *were recorded in the Book of Chronicles: but afterwards the Prieſts were not recorded, but only the Heads of the* Levites, *and thoſe only during the High Prieſthood of* Eliaſhib *and* Joiada. By *Afterwards* here, nothing can be meant, but after the Reign of *Darius Nothus*; and ſo the Gentleman ſaith *Afterwards*, i. e. *after the Reign of Darius Nothus the Prieſts were not recorded, but only the heads of the* Levites; and then, when he adds, *and thoſe only during the High Prieſthood of Eliaſhib* and *Joiada*; it cannot be avoided, but that he makes *Eliaſhib* to have been High-Prieſt *after the Reign of Darius Nothus*; being contrary herein (that I may ſay nothing of Archbiſhop *Uſher*) to himſelf; for *pag.* 10. he makes *Joiada* to have ſucceeded *Eliaſhib* five years before the end of *Darius*'s Reign. But to paſs this, the Gentleman ſays, that *the heads of the* Levites *were recorded only during the High Prieſthood of* Eliakim *and* Joiada, *who were then dead, but not of* Johanan. But if the heads of the *Levites* in the days of *Johanan*, and ſo in the days of *Jaddua* were not recorded, I would gladly know why they are named, *v.* 22. as well as thoſe in the days of *Eliaſhib* and *Joiada*. But his giving us both ſo ſtrange a tranſlation of part of *v.* 22. and ſo ſtrange an Interpretation of the two verſes proceeded from hence, that he thought the *Darius* ſpoken of, was neceſſarily *Darius Nothus*.

Thence alſo proceeded that which follows in the ſame *pag.* 7. *As for* Jaddua, *he is mention'd both here* (i. e. Neh. 12. 22.) *and before in this Chapter,* (i. e. *v.* 11.) *not as being High Prieſt then,* (*how could he be in his Father's days?*) *but only as being then living, and Heir apparent of the High Prieſthood*; *ſo the words are underſtood by the moſt Learned Primate.* By *Then*, this Gentleman means the time when the Book of *Nehemiah* was written, which he fanſies was when *Jaddua*'s Father, *Johanan*, entred upon the High-Prieſt's Function; hence is that Parentheſis, *how could he be in his Father's days?* But it hath appear'd already, that it is a Groundleſs fancy, that *Nehemiah* writ his Book at that time; and ſo all this that

is built upon it, falls of it ſelf. As to the Primate's judgment, I attribute very much to it; but this Gentleman that takes leave to depart from it when he thinks fit, cannot reaſonably deny the like liberty to others.

Page 12. We are told concerning him that married the Daughter of *Sanballat* the *Horonite*, that *Nehemiah* (*ch.* 13. 28.) *calleth him one of the Sons of* Joiada, *the Son of* Eliaſhib *the High Prieſt*, and that this is *plain enough to ſhew that he was the younger Brother of* Johanan *the Father of* Jaddus. But I deny that it is plain enough to ſhew it, and my Ground is from this Gentleman's own words: *Pag.* 5. he ſays that *Johanan the High-Prieſt is called the Son of* Eliaſhib (*Neh.* 12. 23.) *who indeed was his Grandfather, and his Father was* Joiada, *Neh.* 12. 10. Juſt ſo here *Jaddus*'s Brother is call'd one of the Sons of *Joiada*, who indeed was his Grandfather, and his Father was *Johanan*. 'Tis uſual to call Grandſons by the name of Sons: So that with the greateſt part of the Learned Men that have writ on this ſubject, we may ſtill believe not the Uncle, but the Brother of *Jaddus* to be the perſon ſpoken of, *Neh.* 13. 28. and that *Joſephus* his Narration concerning *Manaſſeh*, is an excellent comment upon that Text.

I willingly acknowledge, that I want ſome light to help me to diſcover the neceſſity of thoſe conſequences, *pag* 9. *If* Jaddus *was but* 30 *years old when he came to be High-Prieſt, then the age of* Jolakim *when he dyed, muſt have been at leaſt* 90 *years, his Son* Eliaſhib *at leaſt* 62, *his Son* Joiada *near* 70, *his Son* Johanan *near* 60, *and each of theſe it is very probable much more; and four of theſe muſt have been born when their Fathers were but* 20 *years old*. How theſe conſequences can be made out, I do not apprehend.

It remains that we examine that view of the years of the *Perſian* Kings, and *Jewiſh* High-Prieſts, which he gives us *pag.* 10. and we ſhall quickly find that his Chronology therein is as to a great part of it meerly conjectural, or at the beſt very uncertain. Of the time of *Nehemiah*'s writing his Book, I have ſhew'd the uncertainty above. This Gentleman tells us, *pag.* 9. that *Jaddus might have been born* 20 *years before his Father* Johanan *came to be High-Prieſt*, and that he *ſuppos'd him born* 30 *years before in compliance with the moſt Learned Primate*: Which Primates Judgment, he not-with-

withſtanding this, departs from in other particulars of this view, (as to omit other inſtances) when the Primate refers *Nehemiah*'s coming from *Suſa* to *Jeruſalem*, to the 454th year before Chriſt, this Gentleman refers it to the 445th year before him.

As to the *Perſian* Monarchs, the View out of *Ptolemy*'s *Canon*, makes *Darius Nothus* to have reigned 19 years, *Artaxerxes Mnemon* 46, *Ochus* 21, *Arſes* 2. But *Diodorus Siculus* (whoſe Authority may at leaſt counterbalance *Ptolemy*'s) gives only 43 years to *Artaxerxes Mnemon*, but 23 to *Ochus*, and ſpeaks of *Arſes* his third year (ſee *Diod. Sic. l.* 13. *l.* 15. and *l.* 16.) *Sulpitius Severus* alſo gives 23 to *Ochus*, and 3 to *Arſes*. The ſame *Sulpitius Severus* allots 62 years to *Artaxerxes Mnemon*, which *Plutarch* in *Artaxerxes* doth alſo, and *Cteſias* (who had the greateſt advantages of knowing, how long he reign'd) gives to *Darius Nothus* 35 years: So that the beſt Authors differing thus one from another, how can we determine how long they reign'd. I have not *Ptolemy*'s *Canon* by me, but take it for granted, that he allots the number of years forementioned to theſe Kings.

As for the High Prieſts, the View out of *Georgius Syncellus* aſſigns to *Eliaſhib* 34 years; but the *Chronicon Alexandrinum* gives him 40 years, as the Ἐπιτομὴ χρόνων apud *Scaliger.* alſo doth.

It is ſomewhat ſtrange, that this Gentleman ſhould refer the death of *Joiakim* to *An.* 445. before Chriſt, and yet refer his Son *Eliaſhib*'s being High Prieſt to the year after: I had thought that the Son being Heir apparent to the High Prieſthood, had ſucceeded immediately upon the Father's Death. It is the more ſtrange, becauſe having ſaid *pag.* 8. that it appears that *Joiakim* dyed the ſame year that *Nehemiah*'s Government began; he gives this reaſon for it, *for his Son* Eliaſhib *was High Prieſt at the time when the Wall of* Jeruſalem *was building*: For I believe that the Wall of *Jeruſalem* was building, yea, was finiſh'd the ſame year that *Nehemiah*'s Government began. And if ſo, it is more certain, that *Eliaſhib* was High Prieſt the ſame year that his Government began; than it is, that *Joiakim* dyed that year. Yea, but ſays this Gentleman, *It is certain, that* Joiakim *was High Prieſt within the time while* Nehemiah *was Governour.* And this he thinks may be prov'd from *Neh.* 12. 26. where the words are, *Theſe*

These were in the days of Joiakim, *the Son of* Jeshua, *the Son of* Jozadak, *and in the days of* Nehemiah *the Governour.* Now it is certain from these words, that *Joiakim* was High Priest within the time while *Nehemiah* was Governour; it is said in the same Chapter, that *all* Israel *in the days of* Zerubbabel, *and in the days of* Nehemiah, *gave the portions of the Singers*, Neh. 12. 47. Is it certain from hence, that *Zerubbabel* and *Nehemiah* govern'd for some time together? I say then, that it is more certain (particularly from *Neh.* 3. 1.) that *Eliashib* was High Priest the same year that *Nehemiah's* Government began, than it is, that *Joiakim* dyed the same year.

This, Sir, may suffice to give you a taste of the Gentleman's Chronology. I only add that I am

Your very Affectionate Friend and Servant.

FINIS.